S/N: 09/607,374

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested in view of the following remarks. Prior to entry of this response, Claims 40-59 were pending in the application, of which Claims 40 and 50 are independent. In the Office Action dated January 12, 2007, Claims 40-59 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a). Following this response, Claims 40-59 remain in this application. Applicants hereby address the Examiner's rejections in turn.

I. Interview Summary

Applicants thank Examiner Basom for the courtesy of a telephone interview on March 20, 2007, requested by the undersigned to discuss the rejection of the current claims under 35 U.S.C. § 103. During the interview, Applicants asserted that the cited references do not anticipate or render obvious the claims as currently amended. No agreement we reached regarding patentability.

II. Rejection of the Claims Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In the Office Action dated January 12, 2007, the Examiner rejected Claims 40 and 45-48 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 5,361,361 ("*Hickman*") in view of Managing On-line Help ("*Irwin*"). Furthermore, the Examiner rejected Claims 50 and 55-58 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hickman* in view of *Irwin* in view of PDF Reference Manual Version 1.2 ("*PDF Reference Manual*"). Claims 40 and 50 have been amended, and Applicants

-9-

respectfully submit that the amendments overcome these rejections and add no new matter.

Amended Claim 40 is patentably distinguishable over the cited art for at least the reason that it recites, for example, "the computer having installed on the computer a plurality of different software components and a plurality of different hardware components wherein a first vendor corresponds to a first component selected from the plurality of different software components and the plurality of different hardware components and a second vendor corresponds to a second component selected from the plurality of different software components and the plurality of different hardware components, the first vendor and the second vendor being included in the different vendors." Amended Claim 50 includes a similar recitation.

In contrast, *Hickman* at least does not teach or suggest the aforementioned recitation. For example, *Hickman* merely discloses a hierarchical integrated help utility that integrates help information across multiple independent applications. (*See* col. 1, lines 52-53.) *Hickman* alleges that it improves conventional help utility functionality by providing help file directory 313 within application 310, help file directory 323 within application 320, and the integrated help utility 340. (*See* col. 4, lines 30-34.) While *Hickman* states that it integrates help information across multiple independent applications, nowhere in *Hickman* does it disclose that these multiple independent applications are from different vendors. Moreover, *Hickman* is completely silent with respect to help information associated with hardware components. Rather *Hickman* deals exclusively with software components.

-10-

S/N: 09/607,374

Furthermore, *Irwin* does not overcome *Hickman's* deficiencies. *Irwin* merely discloses managing on-line help in a networked multi-platform environment. Like *Hickman*, *Irwin* at least does not teach or suggest independent applications from different vendors nor does it teach or suggest help information associated with hardware components.

Moreover, *PDF Reference Manual* does not overcome *Hickman's* and *Irwin's* deficiencies. *PDF Reference Manual* merely discloses portable document format files structures. Like *Hickman* and *Irwin*, *PDF Reference Manual* at least does not teach or suggest independent applications from different vendors nor does it teach or suggest help information associated with hardware components.

In addition, and as stated by the Examiner, *Hickman* at least does not teach or suggest a first level of categories and a second level of categories in a unified taxonomy structure being predefined and static. (*See* Office Action, page 6, lines 16-19.) Furthermore, Applicants respectfully submit that *Irwin* does not overcome *Hickman's* deficiencies. *Irwin* merely discloses a top-level "read me" file describing the structure of a help directory. Nowhere in *Irwin* does it disclose two category tiers in a unified taxonomy structure being predefined and static. Rather *Irwin* merely discloses a "read me" file containing help information. Moreover, *PDF Reference Manual* does not overcome *Hickman's* and *Irwin's* deficiencies. *PDF Reference Manual* merely discloses portable document format files structures. Like *Hickman* and *Irwin*, *PDF Reference Manual* at least does not teach or suggest a first level of categories and a second level of categories in a unified taxonomy structure being predefined and static.

-11-

S/N: 09/607,374

Combining *Hickman* with *Irwin* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Hickman* and *Irwin*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "the computer having installed on the computer a plurality of different software components and a plurality of different hardware components wherein a first vendor corresponds to a first component selected from the plurality of different software components and the plurality of different hardware components and a second vendor corresponds to a second component selected from the plurality of different software components and the plurality of different hardware components, the first vendor and the second vendor being included in the different vendors," as recited by amended Claim 40. Moreover, combining *Hickman* with *Irwin* and *PDF Reference Manual* would not have led to the claimed invention because *Hickman*, *Irwin*, and *PDF Reference Manual*, either individually or in combination, at least do not disclose or suggest "the computer having installed on the computer a plurality of different software components and a plurality of different hardware components wherein a first vendor corresponds to a first component selected from the plurality of different software components and the plurality of different hardware components and a second vendor corresponds to a second component selected from the plurality of different software components and the plurality of different hardware components, the first vendor and the second vendor being included in the different vendors," as recited by amended Claim 50. Accordingly, independent Claims 40 and 50 each patentably distinguishes the present invention over the cited art, and Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of these rejections of Claims 40 and 50.

-12-

Dependent Claims 41-49 and 51-59 are also allowable at least for the reasons described above regarding independent Claims 40 and 50, and by virtue of their respective dependencies upon independent Claims 40 and 50. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection of dependent Claims 41-49 and 51-59.

III.   Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, Applicants respectfully request the reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims. The preceding arguments are based only on the arguments in the Office Action, and therefore do not address patentable aspects of the invention that were not addressed by the Examiner in the Office Action. The claims may include other elements that are not shown, taught, or suggested by the cited art. Accordingly, the preceding argument in favor of patentability is advanced without prejudice to other bases of patentability. Furthermore, the Office Action contains a number of statements reflecting characterizations of the related art and the claims. Regardless of whether any such statement is identified herein, Applicants decline to automatically subscribe to any statement or characterization in the Office Action.

-13-

S/N: 09/607,374

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge

any additional required fees to our deposit account 13-2725.

Respectfully submitted,

MERCHANT & GOULD P.C.

P.O. Box 2903
Minneapolis, MN 55402-0903
404.954.5066

Date: April 11, 2007

D. Kent Stier
Reg. No. 50,640

DKS:mdc

27488
PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE

-14-